

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

In a Submission of Replacement Drawings filed concurrently herewith, Applicants respectfully request to amend Figures 1 and 2 to correct the sectional cross-hatching of reference numerals 126 (Figure 1), 113 (Figures 1 and 2), and 114 (Figures 1 and 2).

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-18 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The drawings stand objected to because the sectional cross-hatching of reference numerals 126 (Figure 1), 113 (Figures 1 and 2), and 114 (Figures 1 and 2) is incorrect.

The Abstract stands objected to because of the inclusion of legal phraseology, such as “comprising” (page 49, line 2).

Claim 13 contains the following minor informality: line 2, “;” should be “.” because it is the end of the sentence.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended the Abstract. Applicants have amended dependent claim 13 to correct the informality.

In addition, Applicants submit concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings.

**The Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings stand objected to because the sectional cross-hatching of reference numerals 126 (Figure 1), 113 (Figures 1 and 2), and 114 (Figures 1 and 2) is incorrect.

Applicants amend the drawings in accordance with the comments of the Office Action, MPEP § 608.02, and 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(o). Specifically, Applicants add a suitable legend to indicate the composition of layers 126, 113, and 114 as shown in Figures 1 and 2, and defined in the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

**The Objection to the Abstract**

The Abstract stands objected to because of the inclusion of legal phraseology, such as “comprising” (page 49, line 2). Applicants amend the Abstract in accordance with the comments of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

**The Minor Informality of claim 13**

Claim 13 contains the following minor informality: line 2, “;” should be “.” because it is the end of the sentence. Applicants amend dependent claim 13 in accordance with the comments of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**


The foregoing statements are made to place the application in condition for allowance. A favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Jason E. Gettleman  
Reg. No. 55,202

Dated: February 23, 2006

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001